

## Christopher Field, Japanese Linguist

Simultaneous and Consecutive Technical and General Interpreting, Certified Written Translation



52 Shermans Bridge Rd., Wayland MA 01778  
tel. 617-905-6060 email: [cfinterpreting@gmail.com](mailto:cfinterpreting@gmail.com) www.christopherfield.com

### **DEPOSITIONS:** Recent representative depositions:

2022: SEL v CSOT/TCL. OLED logic circuit design. Retained by Fish & Richardson

2022: Astellas v Sandoz et al: Extended release pharma technology. Retained by joint defendants.

2021: Otsuka Pharma v Generic makers. Medicinal chemistry related patents. Retained by Finnegan

2021: Stone Energy v Nippon Steel/Mitsui Sumitomo Marine. Steel pipe failure in oil well involving metallurgy, materials analysis, electron micrography, etc. Retained by Nippon Steel side. .

2021: Nichia Chemical v Amazon, Home Depot et al. Transparent filament LED technology. Retained by Benesch Friedlander et al

2021: Gree Inc. v Supercell Oy. Patent dispute over video game software. Retained by Gree/Kilpatrick Townsend (via remote platform)

2020: Toray/LG Chem v SKI. Patent dispute over electric vehicle battery separator films. Retained by Toray/Fish & Richardson (via remote platform)

2019: University of California v Amazon, Target, et al. Patent dispute over certain LEDs. Witness: Blue LED inventor Shuji Nakamura. Retained jointly by MOFO, Nixon Peabody, and others representing respective parties

2019: Broadcom v Panasonic, Japan Radio, et al. ITC patent dispute over GPS and other electronic and firmware/software patent infringement. Retained by DLA Piper.

2019: Harvard University/Sionyx v Hamamatsu Photonics. Patent dispute over design of high asperity-ratio image capture elements. Retained by Nikon.

2019 Bartlit Beck v Okada. Subject: Financial dispute. Retained by Bartlit law firm.

I have also interpreted at numerous trials and arbitrations, including:

### **TRIALS**

2022: US vs Miyauchi: Endangered species smuggling case. Retained by US Govt.

2019: (April) Harvard University v Hamamatsu photonics (image sensors; jointly retained by both sides), Federal District Court, Boston; (May) USA v H. Yabe (criminal sentencing in pharmaceutical case, retained by US Court District of NJ); (June) Broadcom v Toyota, Panasonic, JRC, Denso, et al (navigation technology; jointly retained by all parties), ITC

2018: (March) Nikon v Zeiss, ITC (image process; jointly retained by both sides); (April) Fujifilm-Hologic, ITC (mammography imaging; jointly retained by both sides); (July) Nikon v Zeiss, Fed District Court (LA) (image processing; jointly retained by both sides); (August) IV v Honda, Toyota, et al (plastic encapsulated electric motors; jointly retained by all parties); (November) Xtera v NEC, ITC (undersea cable technology; jointly retained by both sides)

2017: District of Delaware. Intellectual Ventures v Toshiba. NAND-flash memory technology patents. Interpreted direct and cross for two Japanese witnesses. Retained by DLA Piper/Toshiba.

2014: Central District of California (Riverside). Kaneka v SKC. Polyimide film (for semiconductors) patents. Interpreted cross-examination of 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan/SKC

2013: Western District of Wisconsin (Madison). Toshiba v Imation. Storage media patents. Interpreted for 1 Japanese witness. Retained by Morrison & Foerster/Toshiba

2012: Northern District of Illinois (Chicago). Fujitsu Ltd v Tellabs. Optical amplifier patents. Interpreted for two witnesses. Retained by Orrick/Fujitsu. \*Note: Judge James Holderman presided. After a break, before the jury was resealed, Judge Holderman addressed the courtroom to commend the interpreter (myself) on the record for an exceptional job.

2012: Dallas TX Federal Court. GE v Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. Wind turbine patents. Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan/Mitsubishi

2010: Federal Court, District of Delaware. Shionogi v Watson et al. Pharmaceutical/ANDA case. Interpreted cross-examination of two witnesses. Retained by Knobbe Martens/Watson et al

2009: ITC, Toyota v Solomon. Hybrid automobile patents; one of 3 hybrid cases in which I was retained at Toyota's request; in other cases a neutral interpreter was retained for the trial. Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Finnegan Henderson/Toyota

2008 International Trade Commission (ITC). Samsung v Sharp. LCD technology. interpreted cross examination of 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Fish and Richardson/Samsung

2008: San Diego Federal Court. Honda Motor Co v Calcar. Case concerned navigation patents asserted against Honda. Interpreted for 2 or 3 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Fish and Richardson/Honda.

## **ARBITRATIONS/MEDIATIONS**

2022: Mediation, SEL/CSOT

2022: Arbitration, Remote. Mitsubishi Power Systems v Hyundai Marine et al: Liability dispute involving complex metallurgy analysis in steam turbines. Retained by Mitsubishi/Kim & Chang

2021: Arbitration, Seoul, Korea: Mitsubishi Power Systems v Hyundai Marine. Fully onsite arbitration. I was asked to interpret for all technical witnesses. Subject matter pertained to high temperature coatings, vibration/resonance phenomena, etc. Presiding arbitrator made special mention of interpreting skill.

2021: Arbitration, Palo Alto, CA: Nidec Corp v Seagate Technologies. Combination onsite and remote; I interpreted for all Japanese witnesses including highly technical subject matter pertaining to motor design, etc. Presiding arbitrator made special mention of interpreting skill and stamina.

2021: Arbitration, SF, CA: Seagen v Dai-ichi Sankyo. Medicinal chemistry; two week arbitration. Retained by MOFO on behalf of Seagen.

2020: Arbitration, Tokyo Japan: EWP v MPW/MHI. Dispute over liability resulting from blade failure in 1000MW steam turbine. Interpreted preparation and in-depth examination of 3 senior engineers covering topics of metallurgy such as fracture initiation, stress, testing methods, analytical techniques, etc. Selected by Mitsubishi to fly to Japan and 2 week complete quarantine to enable on-site interpreting for this international arbitration, conducted remotely by a tribunal in Paris.

2020: Arbitration, New York, NY: Trividia Health v Nipro Corp. Supplier agreement dispute. Interpreted examination of 6 Japanese witnesses in case pertaining to home glucose monitors. Retained by Sheppard Mullin.

2017: Arbitration, New York, NY. Toshiba v Samsung. Contract dispute. Interpreted for two Japanese witnesses. Retained by Latham & Watkins/Toshiba. \*Note: At the conclusion of the Japanese witness portion, the president of the arbitration panel made a statement on the record to the effect that the interpreting had contributed greatly to the panel's understanding of the case.

2016: Arbitration, New York NY. Philips Electronics v Nikon. Semiconductor fabrication equipment (steppers). Interpreted for 2 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Morrison Foerster/Nikon

2016: Arbitration, San Francisco CA. Southern California Edison (utility) v Mitsubishi Nuclear Energy Systems. Case concerned compensation for a failed steam generator at SCE's power plant. Interpreted for approximately 5 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Irell Manella/Mitsubishi

2011: Arbitration, Boston MA. PCMS v Seiko Epson. Interpreted for one witness. Retained by MOFO/Seiko Epson

2010: International arbitration, Zurich, Switzerland. Westinghouse v Mitsubishi Heavy Industries. Nuclear reactor vessel technology. Interpreted for 3 Japanese witnesses. Retained by Irell Manella/Mitsubishi. \*Note: European arbitrators required simultaneous interpretation of proceedings.

## **EXPERT WITNESS**

2021: Retained by DLA Piper, counsel for Apple, in litigation against Maxell. Applied translation experience, lexicographic tools, and linguistic analysis in expert report analyzing key translation terms in relevant prior art. Defended same in deposition.